

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

---

*"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."*

---

VOL. 4.

New-York, November, 1849.

NO. 7.

---

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

---

ANGELL & ENGEL, PRINTERS, 1 SPRUCE-ST.

This JOURNAL will be issued on the first of each month at One Dollar a year, in advance. City subscribers will be regularly served at their residences by sending their names to 762 Broadway.

Subscribers may remit to the Editor, by mail the amount of their subscription.

Subscribers can have the Journal sent to them by mail, on the above terms.

All communications must be addressed, (post paid) to the Editor, 762 Broadway.

---

## AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

---

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1849.

---

### TRUTHS AND THEIR RECEPTION.

On no scientific subject whatever are the general public so little instructed as on medicine; it being the invariable rule of all medical practitioners, and one in which they present a contrast to almost all other professional men, to discourage every thing like inquiring into the peculiar mysteries of their art. The geologist, the mechanic, the astronomer, the chemist, the botanist, and, indeed, each and all of the followers of the other sciences, are only too happy in all occasions to find persons who will talk with them, and endeavor to penetrate into every thing they know; but the medical philosopher invariably declines to encourage amateurs of any kind. Whether this arises from a benevolent caution, unknown to the astronomer, or mechanic, or chemist—since a man might do as much mischief by a misapplication of astronomy, mechanics, and chemistry, in attempting to steer a ship, or to open a dyke, or to make an explo-

sive compound, as by a misapplication of the healing art—it is not necessary to inquire. It is enough for our present purpose, to show that the public are generally without any definite views whatever, either in the theory or practice of medicine, and that, consequently opposition to any new doctrine respecting it is not likely to arise from actual prejudice on their part; and as the announcement of such new doctrine would, in addition to the charm of novelty, commend itself by benevolence, there is in fact, every reason to believe that they would, under ordinary circumstances, manifest a favorable disposition towards its reception.

Still, it has been observed that, as a general rule, not only do they abstain from manifesting any favorable disposition towards Homœopathy, but that they avoid the discussion of it, with a degree of earnestness amounting frequently to something like bitterness. This, however, although it cannot be accounted for by prejudice against the introduction of a new doctrine in medicine, can easily be explained by the fact, which it is the object of this essay to neutralize, of the hostility of the majority of the medical profession. Although the public entertain no particular prejudice against discussing any medical point whatever, on the assumption, that if it were desirable it should be discussed at all, the members of the profession would long ago have set them the example.

It is not enough, however, to reason out the point. There are some minds, to whom our practical example is worth more than a volume of argument. Let us, therefore, take a glance at what is recorded of the early reception and progress of some of the reforms, and discoveries which are now universally recognized, and the instances of which may occur to us at random.

First, we may make a selection from the

records of moral progress. It can safely be stated that no discovery in practical morality has been of more importance to society, than that which exhibited the error of adopting, in the treatment of criminals, an indiscriminate and sanguinary legislation. So recently as 1819, the punishment of death applied to about 150 minor degrees of offence, some of them, according to Sir James Mackintosh, of the most frivolous and fantastic description. As an example, it may be stated that, among the crimes against which this penalty was specified, were "taking any fish out of any river or pond," "injuring of Westminster Bridge," "breaking down the head or mound of a fish pond," &c.; and it was also liable to be enforced against "gipsies remaining within the kingdom one month;"—offences by the side of which "sending threatening letters," "shoplifting," "horse, deer, and sheep stealing," and "turnpike levelling," appear acts of peculiar enormity; and such as need not be enumerated with surprise, as also involving the same doom. Now, if the argument we have urged in the preceding pages be correct, it will not have been from lawyers or judges that the discovery of the fallacy of this mode of proceeding was first made known; but on the contrary, we must expect to find that the great argument against those who advocated a better system, consisted, as at the present day in the case of Homœopathy, in the fact that those whose special province it was to investigate and decide upon the matter, were unequivocally of opinion that the new theory would not do, and ought not to be entertained. Accordingly, we find that from the year 1750 downwards, constant attempts were made in the House of Commons to amend the criminal laws, and that these attempts were constantly frustrated by the upper House, where the predominance of the law-lords has always been most powerful.

When Sir Thomas More, in 1520, first ventured to question the advantage of putting men to death for petty offences, "the lawyers," it is said "all fell upon him," and charged him with ignorance of judicial affairs; and although it is true that one of his opponents, who was most energetic in commending the punishment, and who had just expressed his satisfaction that thieves were then dealt with so severely that there were sometimes twenty on one gibbet, admitted himself greatly perplexed at the fact that, while so few es-

caped, there were yet so many left that no place was safe from them; he still maintained that "a different method could *never* be pursued in England, without endangering the whole nation."

In 1813, when Sir Samuel Romilly brought in a bill for abolishing the punishment of death for privately stealing to the amount of 5s., Sir Thomas Plumer, the Attorney General, expressed his disapprobation of it, stating at the same time that he was supported in his opposition by the opinions of *all* the judges, and of the Recorder and common Sergeant of London. Lord Ellingborough deprecated such discussion, and said he should resist the further introduction of an innovating spirit into our criminal legislation. One member quoted the maxim, *Nolumus leges Anglia mutari*, and another admitted that "the strongest argument he had heard against the bill was the *opinion of the Judges*." At the same time he observed, "it might be remarked that there was a propensity in all professional men to resist every deviation from establishment usages."

The bill passed the Commons by a majority of 72 against 34. It was, however, thrown out in the Lords by a majority of nearly two to one. "All the ministers, *law-lords*, and bishops," it is stated in the Annual Register, "voted against it."

Again, when in the year 1830 an attempt was made to repeal the punishment of death in cases of forgery excepting the forgery of wills, it was opposed by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Tenterden, Lord Wynford, and Lord Eldon; and the point most strongly urged against the measure was, that "there could be little doubt infinitely greater weight was due to the experience of these high judicial characters in a matter with which they had been conversant as the business of their lives, than to the abstract speculations of mere theorists, founded in no satisfactory data." The mere theorists, however, had gradually gained the day in all the former cases, and in this they were also destined to find success. The punishment of death has long since been removed from each of the crimes to which we have referred, and with the best results; the legal mind, however, has not altered, and every new amelioration that is proposed has still encountered the hostility of the profession, and to meet, as in the time of Sir Thomas More, the invariable declaration that the contemplated change can never be adopted, without endangering the whole nation.

Having thus selected an illustration from the highest point connected with moral progress, it may next be appropriate to take one from the history of physical science. In this case, also we shall make choice of one of the grandest and most momentous movements which that history presents.

When in the year 1474, Christopher Columbus matured his theory of the existence of a western continent, his natural impulse in seeking the means to enable him to demonstrate the truth of his conception was to apply to those who, like the judges in the case of capital punishment, had been "conversant with the subject" of navigation "as the business of their lives," and accordingly he offered his services, to the great maritime republic, Genoa. No people at that time in existence were better capable, if the doctrine is to be received that professional habits and interests are the true things to promote a sound and favorable judgment, of deciding upon the merit of his plan, than the Genoese, and never had anything been presented more calculated to throw lustre on the peculiar science the cultivation of which, within its routine limits had rendered them great and famous. The few dry words, however, in which the fate of the proposal is recorded, are, that it was "rejected as the dream of a chimerical projector."

But Columbus was not to be thwarted by this rebuff; and as he seemed, with an infatuation which would have done honor to the present day, to cling to the opinion, that it was from professional men that a professional discovery must be expected to find reception, he next submitted his plan to Portugal, the people of which country also were then amongst "the most experienced navigators in Europe." The king listened to him; and Columbus, with his desire for professional sympathy, must have been delighted, when the matter was referred to the most eminent cosmographers, whom his majesty had been in the habit of consulting, and who had not only performed the functions of "chief directors of the Portuguese navigation," but had given most attention to the question of the passage of India, which it was the aim of Columbus to discover. But alas! the record is that here, again, the prejudices of these persons were sufficient to baffle his success, "since," as it is observed by Dr. Robertson, "they, could not approve of his proposal, without the mortification of acknowledging his superior sagacity."

Wearily and dejected, Columbus had now gained experience of what he was to expect from those who, according to the views of the world both then and at the present time, must have been the only proper persons to decide upon his scheme. His next act, therefore, was to proceed to Spain, a country which boasted of no eminent navigators or cosmographers, and which had never made any attempts to extend the ancient limits of discovery. Still, of course, Spain was not without professors of these subjects, and to these professors, such as they were, his proposals were again, in the due order of things, submitted. It is unnecessary to add, that they were reported on with disfavor. "If it was maintained, there were really any such countries, as Columbus pretended, they could not have remained so long concealed, nor would the wisdom and sagacity of former ages have left the glory of this invention to an obscure Genoese pilot. For five years he had, therefore, to contend, as it has been forcibly remarked, "not only with the obstinacy of ignorance, but what is still more intractable, the pride of false knowledge;" and even at the end of this period, he was destined to meet with a new repulse. From princes, also, of inferior station, one after another, the same mortification was sustained; and it is impossible to doubt that in all these instances the parties consulted, and whose opinions led to the contemptuous discouragement which was manifested, were the individuals most reputed at the respective courts for their studies and experience on this peculiar subject.

At length, however, Columbus being about to leave Spain, a monk together with a medical man, who seemed to have had no due sense of their presumption in forming an opinion in nautical affairs, and who feeling satisfied of the truth of his views, were tormented with the idea that some other country would finally secure the honor of their fulfilment, obtained once more for him a hearing at court. Once more, however, the subject was referred to competent persons, and once more, even in the face of court influence, it was reported upon not only as doubtful, but as in some degree ridiculous. Happily, however, the feelings of the Queen had been enlisted in the cause. The monk and the physician lived to find that they had been right, and that all the cosmographers and navigators of Europe would have done well to have gone to

school to them. The protests of all the authorities, however, were undiminished up to the very hour when the vessels of the adventurous theorist left the shore; and it was only through the womanly enthusiasm of Isabella that he was destined ultimately to announce a new continent to the world.

From these illustrations, selected from the most striking instances of progress in moral and physical science, it would seem fit now to turn to the records of religious advancement.

On this part of the subject, however, it must be unnecessary to expatiate, since every page of that book whence alone mankind derive all of light they can receive, contains the unceasing story of the pride, stubbornness, and envy with which each new revelation of the divine will was rejected by those who, in the eyes of the people, were especially qualified to be its expounders and ministers. From the period when the sorcerers and magicians of Egypt turned away from the wonders wrought by Moses, or from that when the prophets of Baal, numbering four hundred and fifty men, opposed themselves to the signs and exhortations of Elijah, down to the day when every prophecy was made plain, and all that had been promised was fulfilled, the same terrible features of unbounding hostility are shown, varying only by their gradual increase in proportion as the climax of the truth drew near, until at last, no matter what might be the circumstances presented, they were all, however opposite their complexion, received as food for the malignant passion that had been awakened. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he had a devil." The son of man came eating and drinking, and they said, "Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

Throughout the whole history of our Saviour's career there is scarcely the slightest evidence of opposition to his doctrine, except as it was stimulated by the chief priests, and the Scribes and Pharisees. Indeed, day by day, when these parties sought to lay hands upon him, they were prevented because they "feared the people." It was the chief priests who urged the force of authority, that is to say, of "the experience in a matter with which they had been conversant, as the business of their lives," which has since been so often urged by the like-minded of after generations, as suffi-

cient to prevent all inquiry or belief on the part of the multitude. When their own officers even exclaimed, "Never man spake like this man," it was the chief priests who asked, "Are ye also deceived? *Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?*" It was in the palace of the high priest that the plots were laid for procuring false testimony, and it was this personage who rent his clothes, and who, exclaiming that blasphemy had been spoken, impatiently inquired, "what further need have we of witnesses?" It was from the "chief priests" that the great multitude with swords and staves, to bring their victim to judgment, and it was by them that Judas was suborned; it being also to their hands that he returned the thirty pieces of silver he had received. Finally, when we read that Pilate, a mere military governor, was able to see that "for envy they had delivered him," and was accordingly disposed to release him; but that "the chief priests and elders *persuaded* the multitude they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus," and that, true to their character to the very last, when Pilate wrote, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews" they protested, even amidst the awful signs of that closing scene, "write not the King of the Jews, but that he said, I am the King of the Jews," we have a picture of the uncompromising pride of professional caste, knowledge, and self-interest, perhaps only more sublime than any other ever presented because the revelations against which it was directed was the highest and most beneficent ever given our race.

Has human nature wholly changed since that hour, or is it the same in its main features except the partial improvement it has undergone by the slow progress of the lessons of forbearance and humility which were then sealed. The hearts of all people will at once answer the question. The same spirit prevails, although modified in some by the influence of the Christian doctrine, and it is consequently worse than ignorance or mockery to pretend that at the present day the public should look in the first instance to the high priests of the various department of knowledge for the reception of such new developments regarding the laws of the universe, as the Creator may in His wisdom be pleased to place before us.

*To be Continued.*



### THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE ALLOPATHIC TO THE HOMŒOPATHIC SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

ALL sorts of efforts have been put forth to prevent the progress of Homœopathia. In no period as at the present, has there been such deep, strong, fixed and burning feelings to destroy the peculiar distinctive marks of genuine Homœopathia. The completeness of her science, and the precision of her art requires a close and careful study of the individuality of each case of disease in all the minuteness of its details, and a similar labor in finding the remedy; these are so unlike Allopathia, that those who are educated only in her baseless theories and in her pernicious art, are not likely to look with favor on a system, which to understand and practice, requires them to be educated anew.

The Allopathic school is divided into the Eclectic, the Thompsonian and the Botanic; these have their colleges, their teachers, and their practitioners, and have been regarded heretofore as essentially differing. However this may be in their language and in their theories, they meet and agree on two points in which everything essential to them are embraced: 1st, they attempt to found theories of cure upon theories of disease. 2d, their treatment is directed to diminish or increase the vital force by evacuations and stimulants; hence their emetics, cathartics, sudorifics, sialogogues, tonics, stimulants, &c., together with venesection. They are, therefore, on common ground in practice, for the difference is in form only, not in fact.

This very brief notice of the Allopathic school of medicine is undeniable, and will be recognized as true by every intelligent and unprejudiced reader. Thousands have experience of its truth in their own persons, who have been treated by all of them in turn, and found the same result in the various forms in which drugs were administered. Heretofore a necessity was laid upon the sick, to submit to one or another of these classes of physicians; and many did so with a sort of innate reluctance, while others, yielding to the influence of a good judgment, refused all such medication and trusted their health and life to "nature," rather than run the risk of large quantities of poisonous substances prescribed in the name of *science*. The Allopathic school admits, in truth almost boasts of the

uncertainty of its science and art, and it is on this ground that it claims the forbearance and charity of the living, for its failure upon the millions who have died, by the appointment as was supposed, of "an inscrutable providence."

The uncertainty of the healing art has been preached for years from every chair in the colleges, and has been a daily topic of conversation among the members of the profession. Journalists also advocated the same doctrine, and even went so far as to assert that it was hardly possible for the healing art to approximate certainty. This doctrine has had a pernicious influence in two ways: 1st, it has led to a loose mode of treating diseases, and a kind of recklessness of human health and life. 2d, these incorrect notions have biased the minds of physicians, and given them an unreasonable bent towards any system that pretends to even an approximation of certainty in the science and art of medicine.

True observers will not, we think, deny these results from the cause we have mentioned. If such do so, we ask them to mark the practice of the Allopath in attendance upon him whose life is regarded of the highest importance by his friends. The physician is urged to exert his skill to the utmost, and sometimes he offers a most remarkable kind of consolation, by informing anxious relations, that "there is nothing certain in medicine." He also says, I will treat this disease on the most approved method, which is that of Dr. —, and if we fail we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that all has been done in the case which is recommended by the most approved authority in the profession. The doctor becomes thereby a mere copyist, an imitator of another, without any regard whatever to a principle. What does he do? He gives a name to the disease, and then administers drugs in an unknown compound, to the disease he supposes is truly represented by the name he sees fit hastily to give it. And such is the absolute uncertainty in naming diseases that it is well known that scarcely two physicians agree, and this is the occasion of detraction among physicians towards one another more than anything else. However deeply an Allopath may feel for a sick friend, he has not, we defy the profession to show it, a single well established principle to guide him in the administration of a remedy, he deals in an imperfect hope; we admit, he *desires* fer-

vently, but when he attempts to *expect*, there is no basis upon which he can fix expectation. In a word, the whole treatment is conducted on "we will try this; we will try that; we will try the other." We state it as a fact, and we have reason to assume that we know, that however honest and however talented, and however learned an Allopath may be, it is utterly out of his power to administer a single dose of any drug upon any established principle, unless he trespasses on Homœopathia.

When, therefore, Hahnemann promulgated his doctrine, it was not at all remarkable that he should have met with the most prompt and violent opposition, for no one acquainted with the human mind and passions could have, for a moment, looked for a different result. Even now, after Homœopathia has been prominently before the profession for a half a century, the opposition is more ardent than ever, and were it not for the intelligence of the people, who judge of it from its results, scarcely a vestige would be seen. The superficial observer may think the "small doses" are the stumbling block, we thought so too, a few years ago, but when we found some practitioners prescribing willingly those doses, but claiming to do so on the physiological and pathological doctrines of the French and Germans, we perceived that they fell into the same uncertainty of the pure Allopaths, and their mode of prescribing was conducted in the same hasty and loose manner. We looked steadily for a long time at these movements, until we are now satisfied that the true ground of opposition is in the exactness of the law of cure, and the universality of its adaptation to all diseases proper. The question of the capability of attenuated medicines to produce effects in the human organism is almost conceded, for it is now declared by those who formerly spoke of them as utterly powerless, that they are potent and actually tend to cause nervous diseases. If then the potency of the "small doses" is admitted, why is not Homœopathia universally embraced by the profession?

The answer to this question is, the profession generally do not perceive it possible to have a complete science in medicine. Homœopathia presents herself to them perfect in this respect, which is at once pronounced an absurdity. It will be observed that we invariably keep in view the wide distinction of the

science of medicine and the art of medicine; Homœopathia is perfect in the one, but admits of vast improvement in the other. Another view may be taken of this subject, which perhaps will render it plainer: Homœopathia does not allow of any degree of speculation in diseases or in the remedies, she deals exclusively in facts, and every step of her workings are based upon positively ascertained facts, she never deals in the language of Allopathia, such as "probably," "it is possible," "it may be so," "it is most likely," &c., &c. Hence it was that Hahnemann was able to point out the remedies for the Asiatic cholera, yet not having had an opportunity of testing them in a single case. These remedies as now established, are certain in the cholera; so also, any well instructed Homœopath can, on the appearance of an epidemic disease, which in many things may be entirely new to the profession, select the appropriate remedy, which on trial will be found certain in its curative effects. It is admitted that diseases change in their phenomena; when this happens, it does not at all interrupt Homœopathia, it should not in the least degree embarrass her practitioners, in fact it does not, for they are governed by the actual phenomena distinctly existing before them, and about which there can be no question, consequently a new disease, or a new form of an old one causes no embarrassment whatever; now this is the great stumbling block to most of the profession, they have actually lived so long in darkness that the brilliant rays of the sun cannot be endured, and they close up their eyes and declare that they see nothing; the light is all around them, but their eyes are shut; and those of us who had the courage to open our eyes, although we did so cautiously and gradually, and thereby endured some pain, and a degree of inflammation from its piercing rays, although we call daily and loudly to our colleagues to do as we have done, they tell us in reply, We see nothing, you are a set of hypocrites, you wish to deceive us as you have the people. We continue to say to them, Don't you see the cholera cured? No! Nor the dysentery? No! Nor cholera infantum? No! This seems to us to be nearly the state of things in the Allopathic in relation to the Homœopathic school; but it cannot remain so much longer, especially if genuine Homœopathia is allowed to control the treatment of diseases.

## POWERFUL REMEDIES.

THAT severe diseases must be met with powerful remedies, has long been the belief of the Allopathic School. Some of the more enlightened Allopathists have to some extent seen the error of this notion, and denounced it, but as far as we can learn, it is still held by the great majority of practitioners, and we may say universally by those of the laity who trust themselves, in the hour of sickness, to Allopathic practice. The notion is as erroneous as it is wide spread, and no less pernicious than erroneous. This notion alone has done more to retard the progress of Homœopathia, than all the fulminations of Medical Societies, or all the wit (!) and arguments (!) of medical writers, since it has prevented those who entertain it, from making a practical investigation of Homœopathia. The course of reasoning—we call it *reasoning* through courtesy—by which this principle was reached, is peculiar, and forcibly exemplifies from what gross analogies the practice of Allopathia is deduced. No one can doubt that a desolating fire must be met promptly and energetically—nor can it be disputed that two fire companies, if properly directed, will do at least twice as much good as one in quelling the flame, or that four will do twice as much as two. Nor can it be denied, that if a powerful foe invade the land with fire and sword, he must be met and repelled by a force commensurate with his own. This is all clear enough, but now let us follow our Allopathic friends, and see if the analogy will hold. Here is a patient, suffering, we will say from a raging fever, attended with internal inflammation, which threatens to dry up the springs of life, and hurry its victim into the grave. The attack is violent—the disease severe, says the Allopathist, hence the remedies must be severe and violent. The veins, or perhaps the arteries must be opened to cut off the supplies of the enemy; the bowels must be purged, the stomach puked, the skin blistered, and he will soon find it too hot for him everywhere, and withdraw. Doubtless—but suppose as he retires, he takes the life with him: what then? Oh, well—the disease was violent and could not be overcome—everything was done that could be—at least he died, *secundum artem*, under the hands of a regular practitioner of medicine, which ought to be a source of satisfaction to the patient's friends, though he himself is out of the reach of it. Leaving the sick room, he betakes himself to the street, and meets a Homœopath, and salutes him thus:—I have just lost a case of fever, of a very violent nature—why, I bled him to fainting, half a dozen times within the last ten days—I blistered his head, back, chest, belly and legs—I gave him tartar emetic without stint, and calomel by the twenty grains—I leechd him, and cupped him, and starved him, but all to no purpose—I could not subdue the violence of the disease. What do you suppose your *little pills* could do, continues he,

with a sneer, what do you suppose your little pills could do in such a case as that? Why, if one of the spoonfuls of calomel I gave that man, were dissolved in all the waters of the globe, and a drop of the mixture were given, it would be a stronger dose than you would give; and if a strong dose would not cure him, if all the strong doses and violent means would not cure him, much less would a less dose. This would be admirable reasoning if man were only a machine, and his motions and sensations could be determined by the laws of mechanics, but this is not so. Such analogies disregard the vital principle which presides over all the functions of the body, and modifies or sets at defiance all the laws which govern inanimate matter: hence they must be radically in error, and all rules of practice deducted from them must be false. True, in speaking of disease, of fever for instance, we say that is a *raging* fever, or *violent*, or *severe*, but this is figurative language, otherwise the expression is inappropriate, for in no case is the force of disease in any respect analogous to the force of which inorganic matter is the subject. As there is no force to which the vital force can be compared, nor any machine, to which we can liken the wonderful spiritual and corporeal mechanism with which we are endowed, so there is no force to which these powers, when diseased, can be likened. Disease is as immaterial as life, for it is nothing but life turned aside from its proper orbit, and as life in health is every moment under the influence of immaterial causes, and is swayed hither and thither by them, so may life in sickness be—so it most assuredly is. No mind but one mystified with Allopathic fogs and crudities, can conclude otherwise.

But granting for a moment, that disease is like a mechanical force, which can only be overcome by violent means, is the Allopathic notion on this point *then* shown to be right? By no means. The force must, in the first place, be one that shall be appropriate to the force of the disease—thus no one, (unless it were an Allopathist) would think of subduing a raging fire by the use of a raging wind, nor by numerous or powerful streams of oil or turpentine; and in the next place, it must be used in the proper direction, for no one, with the above-mentioned exception, would think of arresting the course of a train of cars down an inclined plane, by hurling an immense weight on the roofs of the cars, or at one side or the other. This would undoubtedly arrest the train, but how would the passengers relish the treatment? But these things are overlooked by Allopathia. Disease is a force—hence it must be met by a force—no matter whether the force is calculated by its nature or its direction to check the diseased force, or to coincide with and thus increase it: if it is a *force*, that is enough. This is well set forth by Dr. Maunsell, who though an Allopathist, is a very sensible one, at least on this point. Speaking of the violent treatment recommend-

ed by Dr. Armstrong, in Scarlet Fever, he says:

"Those, however, who read his essay carefully, will easily perceive that he was not free from misgivings as to his practice; and it is equally obvious, that he considered the mere circumstance of the disease being severe and violent, as sufficient sanction for the use of severe and violent remedies. Such a notion, though popular and common, is altogether inconsistent with an enlarged view of disease, and justifies the apologue of D'Alembert—the physician being then, truly, a blind man armed with a club, who, as chance directs the weight of his blow, will be certain of annihilating either nature or the disease. A fever being likely, by its violence, to produce speedy death, is no palliation of the guilt of a physician who administers a medicine in poisonous doses, even though he may be ingenious enough to construct a theory explaining, satisfactory to himself, the *secundum artem* character of the murder he commits;" and in a note he adds, "For such practitioners we know no better advice than that of the judicious Huxham—at least to peruse the sixth commandment." This we insert for the benefit of Allopathists whose memory may be treacherous, or to whom a reference might be inconvenient:—

"THOU SHALT NOT KILL."

N. W. Jour. of Hom.

### HOMŒOPATHY IN LONDON.

We perceive by the late European papers that Homœopathy was making as rapid strides in London as it is in this country and on the Continent. The following from the *London Morning Post*, the special organ of the court and aristocracy, looks rather blue for old Saddlebags and Pillbox:

**HOMŒOPATHY IN CHOLERA.**—It is proposed to establish forthwith one hospital at least (more, if the donations be sufficient) either in Lambeth, Bermondsey, or Newington, for the Homœopathic treatment of cholera—a treatment which has been proved to be most eminently successful.

Douglas Jerrold's *Weekly News* also publishes a letter signed by Graf Von Viettinghoff, stating that cholera is created by the pullulation of insects (*Musca carnivora*), whose eggs are introduced into men's intestines by atmosphere and water—recommending camphor as a sovereign remedy against cholera, upon the principle that camphor possesses antiseptic, antifermentescible and concrete property. The late Dr. Samuel Hahnemann, the founder of the Homœopathic law of treating, recommended also camphor as a specific remedy in the first stage of cholera, because camphor, tried repeatedly upon healthy human subjects, produced invariably symptoms very closely corre-

sponding with those of the first stage of cholera, and he saved many thousands by timely application of camphor internally and externally.

In Vienna, Hungary, and Poland the Homœopathic treatment is stated to have saved hundreds of thousands of lives, while, under the 'regular' practice of colomel, opium, &c., &c., the population died off like sheep. In France, where the 'regular' practice of medicine has certainly reached its highest perfection, the physicians—or such of them as would not adopt the Homœopathic remedies—gave up treatment pretty much in despair, and let nature take her course. In this way, doubtless, many lives were saved; although, in the great majority of cases, cholera is a disease that must be speedily arrested by a specific adapted to the peculiar symptoms, or the patient dies. Of all the acsírums and innumerable doses compounded for the cholera, we believe it has now been decided that the 'regular' Allopathic treatment—colomel and opium—is decidedly the worst. And yet, during the last season, when cholera was raging in our midst, and the old-school physicians were paralyzed and helpless before the scourge—the hospital reports showing an average loss of *more than half* of all the cases reported—yet the Common Council turned up its nose in contempt at the application of respectable citizens to appoint Homœopathic physicians to at least one of the hospitals—to do, in fact, what the corporation to London has already done—and this too in the face of the fact that authentic reports of Homœopathic physicians showed a loss of less than twelve per cent. or *one eighth* of the cases treated by them.

How is this to be accounted for? Easily enough. The 'medical Counsel' of the Board of Health—a set of respectable men, but utterly ignorant of the science of health and disease—were all bitter Allopathists, yes, bitter as aloe, and malignant as a blister-plaster. Sooner than have dared to make themselves instrumental in establishing a public test between Allopathy and Homœopathy in the treatment of cholera, they would have seen the city decimated by the invisible sword of the destroyer. And in this they were but carrying out the principles of the 'regular' medical schools, colleges and institutions, which every year turn out their hundred of vampires to literally fatten upon the blood of the community.

We say it is high time that this nefarious system of suppressing vital discoveries in the science of healing diseases should be broken up, and that the medical monopoly, which has so long existed upon the credulity, the fears and the ignorance of mankind, should be broken up. There are now already in New-York over fifty Homœopathic physicians of good standing, and who have received their diplomas from established schools. They embrace in their number a large amount of the medical knowledge, skill and experience in the city: and as to practice, it is perfectly immense—including all classes and conditions. Now, is it rational, is it



decent—that the existence of this great and most successful practical school of medicine shall be utterly overlooked by the professional insolence of a rival school which justly fears its power? Is this not a clear and palpable violation, not only of the spirit but the letter of its duties, by the Medical Counsel of our Board of Health? We do sincerely trust that the approaching winter in Albany will not pass away without somebody being found courageous enough to bring this subject forward, in the face of the whole squadron of lancets, boluses, cataplasms and catheters, and push it home to the conscience of the whole body of our public legislators. The time for sneering at Homœopathy, or attempting the ridiculous farce of ignoring its existence, is long ago past by.—*S. Courier.*

## PRACTICAL REMARKS.

BY DR. W. HUBER.

EVERY practitioner must have felt how much the difficulty of getting up cases in a complete manner has been increased by the radical changes which diagnosis has undergone in recent times. I believe we are to account in this way for the paucity of practical communications in our Homœopathic literature. But ought the solid results of experience in the treatment of diseases to be lost, because not in every instance grounded on anatomical or chemical pathology? Are the new diagnostic helps perfected to such a pitch as always to lead us to the conclusion we are seeking? The scientific practitioner meets daily, in greatest number, with cases in which these boasted sciences leave him altogether in the dark. I hold every Homœopathic physician bound to avail himself of these methods of diagnosis; but to cure is, and ever will be, his chief and highest duty. Therapeutics is the crowning summit of medicine; it is the end to which other medical sciences are the means. Let us, therefore, not imitate our opponents in these latter years, who, in their zealous pursuit of the tributary sciences, assign a subordinate position to the capital one of therapeutics. Whence may this indifference to, or disbelief in, the art of healing among them arise?

I trace it to the new fundamental principle, "Nature alone cures," for which they have latterly discarded the old one, "Contraria contrariis." And they look to this first principle alone, when they might walk in the light of one subordinated to it. In no science has the word "Nature," "power of Nature," been more misapplied than in medicine. It is the stalking-horse to which every idea, even the most extravagant, is yoked, as it is impossible to appeal from it. But when we consider that the *vis natura medicatrix* and its essence are above our comprehension, and is subjectively modified by each one according to his

own turn of mind, we shall perceive the impossibility of making any use of it as an objective reality in practice. Europeans paint the devil black, the Negroes vote him white, and both allege his nature as an argument, and will continue to do so as long as they dwell in the region of imagination.

The *vis medicatrix* is something seated in the sick man himself, and can never become the foundation of an objective and practical science, since no propositions or conclusions are deducible from it. I do not deny—what every school tacitly admits—that the remedial power of nature constitutes a ground for the subjective possibility of a cure, but it is not the only one, nor in practice is it the chief one.

The proposition: Nature produces, Nature sustains; therefore Nature can likewise cure, acquires an altered significance when we consider that these internal processes are connected with certain necessary conditions by which they are determined, limited and modified. But if this subjective tendency be made of importance greater than naturally belongs to it, and clothed with the absolute and supreme attributes of a first principle, nothing but injury can accrue to the therapeutic system thence derived, as experience has amply proved; indeed remedies appear, according to it, completely superfluous, this first principle repelling all impressions by therapeutic agents.

It is far different with our law of similars. It is deduced from the specific relations exhibited by the body to medicinal agents; it is verified by the healing power evinced by them in diseases of similar nature, and thus rests on an objective experimental basis, and is as closely related to therapeutics as the fountain is to the stream, and from its practical utility takes the foremost rank among the truths of scientific therapeutics. The law of similars does not exclude the *vis medicatrix natura*, but rather goes hand in hand with it in harmonious conjunction; they are not contradictory but complimentary to each other; they support and bear out each other, since they have a common direction and a common proceeding to one end by similar processes. In like manner as the internal processes by which the organism grows and maintains its structures, possess no self-sustained and absolute all-powerfulness, but are subject to multifarious outward influences, even so the favorable result or cure does not always and exclusively depend on the curative force of nature, but is often determined by outward influences or remedies. Thus we see that the law of similars does not infringe on the rights of the curative power of nature, that it does not abandon the sick to a relentless fate, that it exalts the character of the physician, and satisfies his conscience by opening to him a wide field for positive action, the careful cultivation of which must be the chief business of the Homœopathic practitioner. Next to physiological provings of medicines, it is by bedside experience that advance is to be made.

As so many additions are now yearly made to the number of students of Homœopathy, who loudly call for an introduction to the practice of the system, and as yet there are no public *cliniques* in which Homœopathy might become attainable by every practitioner who loves the beneficent art; in the meantime, practical results obtained at the bed-side form the most adequate means of acquiring a knowledge of the system. With this idea I resolved to publish a few cases for the use of beginners in this study, that I might at all events lighten their difficulties, more or less. This essay, doubtless, is very imperfect, and offers little to interest the advanced Homœopathist; but if it puts a clue into the hand of a few young learners to guide them in their toilsome path, my end will be answered.

I shall divide the following cases, for convenience' sake, into five groups: Inflammations, Fevers, Cachexiæ, Nervous Affections, and Profuvia.

#### A. INFLAMMATIONS.

##### I.—Tonsillitis.

Josepha Hubinger, æt. 19, fair, of sanguine temperament, of delicate appearance, properly menstruated; she had a bilious fever some years ago. On January 12th, 1846, in consequence of catching cold at church, she shivered strongly for two hours in the evening, then came on general heat, headache, strong thirst, and *sore throat*; lassitude and fatigue felt all over her, which obliged her to go to bed. Next morning the state of the patient was as follows: pressive and shooting frontal headache, heaviness and confusion of the whole head, *photophobia*, tongue rather white, unpleasant slimy taste, much thirst, want of appetite, a little nausea, sometimes inclination to vomit; *deglutition very difficult, with shooting pain in the throat*; constant need to swallow; *tonsils very dark, red and swollen*, especially the right one; great feeling of dryness in the throat, and hard palate; abdomen and fæces normal; urine scanty, dark red, without sediment; the thoracic organs normal; skin dry and warm; pulse feverishly excited, at 100, and tense; extreme exhaustion; disturbed sleep; anxious state of mind.

*Treatment*.—Bell. 3d dil. a drop every third hour in a table-spoonful of water.

Jan. 13th, in the evening.—Increase of the fever and all the symptoms; a sleepless night.

Jan. 14th.—There is not the least trace either of the fever or the other symptoms; the appetite is returned. No more medicine was given. The lassitude left by the attack was quite gone in two days' time.

##### II.—Bronchitis.

Rosina König, æt. 26, unmarried, of sanguine temperament and tolerably robust, has always been regularly menstruated, and has

never been ill. On the 15th February, 1846, in consequence of a chill while at work, was attacked with shiverings lasting several hours, followed by heat, headache, thirst, and disgust to food. Then a shaking dry cough came on, with feeling of rawness in the upper part of the chest; the cough was sometimes spasmodic, and brought on vomiting, lassitude and fatigue of the whole body, obliging her to stay in bed. Various allopathic remedies were fruitlessly employed, and the cough increased in severity, with streaks of blood in the expectoration, up to Feb. 28th, when the symptoms were as follows: shooting pain in the forehead; *swelling and redness* of the face, with burning heat of head; the nose dry and stopped up; the tongue loaded with yellowish-white fur; great thirst; mawkish taste; no appetite; constipation; urine scanty, burning, and of a fiery red; violent cough, especially at night, with expectoration of thin gelatinous mucus mixed with dark brown clotted blood. Inspection of the thorax and percussion showed nothing abnormal; on auscultation there was found all over the chest decided vesicular breathing, and here and there mucous rales, especially over the right lung; heart normal; respiration not much impeded; slight oppression on the chest; *skin very dry and hot*; pulse rapid, beating 80 to the minute, full and very hard. The headache, heat of skin, and cough usually got worse in the evening. Sleep short—disturbed; feeling of sickness, and anxious state of mind.

*Treatment*.—Aconite 3, a drop every third hour, in a table-spoonful of water.

1st March.—No change in the general state.

From 2d to 4th.—Great diminution of the fever; pulse 70; thirst and heat of skin much less; cough less violent, generally dry, no heat of blood. The febrile symptoms were felt in an increased degree for a few hours before midnight, but not to the same degree as formerly.

On the 4th, after a slight exacerbation, a general and abundant sweating came on about 5 p. m., and lasted during sleep almost the whole night, after which the patient woke with a genial sense of decided improvement in her state.

On the morning of the 5th, her head was free from pain; tongue loaded and moist; appetite beginning to return; thirst gone; fæces normal; urine abundant and cloudy, a quantity of brick-colored sediment; cough easy, with loose mucous expectoration without blood. Strong mucous rales in the branches of the right bronchus; skin moist all over and pleasantly warm; pulse at 65, soft and swelling.

On the 6th March.—No trace of fever. On account of the mawkish taste, and considerably increased expectoration of mucus, I discontinued Aconite and gave Pulcamara 2, in the same manner. In five days more the bad taste, mucous rales, cough and expectoration

had quite disappeared, and the patient was left in her former state of health.

### III.—Pneumonia.

Charles Reitinger, æt. 17, unmarried, rather robust, of sanguine temperament, had always since his youth been healthy, with the exception of an eruption on the scalp. On 1st March, 1846, without assignable cause he was attacked with headache, giddiness, nausea, and vomiting of food; then strong shivering for two hours, followed by heat, thirst, difficulty in breathing, tired feeling, and languor of the whole system. After a sleepless night and the fever continuing, *cough with bloody sputa* came on, and he vomited several times a bitter fluid without feeling relieved.

3d March.—Giddiness; *heat; redness and puffiness of the face*; white tongue; bitter taste; *great thirst*; no appetite; tenderness of the pit of the stomach, but not of the rest of the abdomen; no stool since yesterday's; *urine red, scanty*; frequent *cough*, with a little *expectoration* of tough, transparent, greenish mucus, mixed with *bloody and rust-colored particles*; feeling of weight on the chest, with *short and anxious respiration*; dulness on percussion over the left inferior scapular region. The stethoscope applied in this part revealed strong bronchophony and bronchial respiration, combined with a good deal of rattling of mucus. Sound of heart normal; *skin dry and hot*; *pulse accelerated to 95 beats per minute, and hard*; sleep disturbed; much lassitude; anxious frame of mind. The fever and its concomitants were exacerbated a little in the evening and forenoon.

*Treatment*.—Aconite 1, a drop every three hours in water.

3d March, morning.—No change, but there was no increase of fever in the evening, and a quiet sleep, with copious general sweat came on.

4th March, morning.—Decided improvement; head free; eruption of *hydroa febrilis*, on the upper lip; no thirst; skin moist and cooler; pulse soft, and fallen to 65; breathing easier; *cough*, expectoration, and auscultatory signs unaltered. In the evening, after a short and trifling aggravation of the fever, he fell asleep, and slept in a state of perspiration all night.

5th March, morning.—The patient is quite free from fever, and his head from pain; skin had become cool, and his tongue clean; he can taste better, is not thirsty, and can eat a little; the epigastrium may be pressed on without giving pain; the bowels open, the urine cloudy and sufficiently copious with a good deal of flocculent deposit of a light red color. Reitinger could now breathe freely, but coughed often and easily brought up a quantity of phlegm, which might be drawn into long strings. Loud rattling in the left side of the chest. The temperature of the skin and the pulse now perfectly natural. No medicine.

From 5th to 7th March, he got rid of the whole of the fibrine that had exuded into the cells of the lungs, by expectoration; the cough and auscultatory signs gradually disappeared, and on the 8th nothing but vesicular breathing could be discovered in any part of the chest. The patient had lost so little strength as to be able to resume his occupation on the 9th.—*Oest. Zeitsch. f. Hom.*

(To be Continued.)

### For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

DEAR SIR:—When the existence of the Cholera was first admitted among us, the Board of Health sent a circular to each medical man, requiring him to report his cases, daily, with results, but the enormous number of cases reported by some, with hardly any deaths, rendered the whole thing so ridiculous, that the others ceased to report, and no record was kept excepting of the deaths, as furnished by the grave-yard keepers, amounting in all to 1158; 588 of which were from Cholera. The epidemic prevailed about 71 days, from the beginning of July to the end of September. I believe it is generally admitted that over 50 per cent. of all attacked died, whether treated allopathically, or domestically, or not at all. In addition to a large amount of diarrhœa and dysentery, 45 cases of decided Cholera, were treated by my colleague, Dr. B., and myself; of which 39 recovered, and 6 died. They were of all classes in society, and in every stage of development. Without occupying your space with unnecessary details, I may state generally that all who died, as well as several of those who recovered, were treated under the most unfavorable circumstances. We also supply the most of our patients, and a number of those formerly opposed to our system, with the remedies, and prophylactics, several of whom have reported cures; and although not invariably, we have reason to think the Veratrum and Cuprum Aceticum, have proved a protection. We were employed by Ira Gould, Esq., of the City Mills, one of those practical philanthropists, of whom every community yields a few, to visit his establishment daily and prescribe for the workmen and their families; the number of hands employed was 20, of whom 9 had families, in all amounting to 30 more, they all took the prophylactics regularly, and had the remedies at hand, which were in all cases freely administered by Mr. Wilson, the

head miller, till we could be procured. The result was 5 cases of cholera, with several of diarrhœa and dysentery, without any death. Another gentleman, Mr. Holiday, who had 20 hands employed in cooping, of whom 17 had families, was induced to follow Mr. Gould's example with a result still better, viz.: 1 case of cholera with several of diarrhœa and other diseases, and no deaths.

I remain, my dear sir,

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR FISHER, M. D.

Montreal, Oct. 23, 1849.

DR. W. E. PAYNE, of Bath, Me., (Homœopath,) and Dr. SHAW, of the same place, (Allopath,) have had quite a spirited controversy on their respective systems of medicine, which is published in the "Northern Tribune." Dr. Shaw took an unwise course, in allowing himself to misrepresent established facts, in fallacious arguments, and in reiterating false accusations against Hahnemann's professional character; this, we are aware, is the usual custom of Allopathic writers, but they should reform their manners, or all Homœopaths would be warranted in withholding even ordinary courtesy to such lampooners. The inordinate self-esteem of many Allopaths will, after a while, work their ruin. Their contempt for the intelligence of the people on the practice of medicine will not aid in prolonging the existence of a destructive mode in the treatment of diseases. It is, however, but just to state, that as yet, with but one exception, not an able writer of the Allopathic school has attempted to disprove the doctrine of Hahnemann. Dr. Forbes is the only one who can lay claim to this honor, and he gave Allopathia the hardest blow she has received since the author of Homœopathia; but the small fry of his school could not appreciate his honesty, nor the clear view he took of the doctrine and practice of Allopathia; they raised a cry against him, and charged upon him unworthy motives, which is evidence under the circumstances, of their ignorance or dishonesty. The real talent of the old school have not, as yet, spoken of Homœopathia; only the light, vain, trifling and poetic branch of the profession have dared to exhibit their folly in opposition to our system. The men of mind, of education, and of experience, know too well the weakness of Allopathia to attempt

a direct written attack on Homœopathia; for if the latter is false, it is as good as the former.

Our patience is nearly exhausted at the twattle of those who are not qualified to express an opinion, of any value, on Homœopathia.

## HAHNEMANN AND HIS WIFE.

BY HELEN BERKLEY.

Who is Hahnemann? What is homœopathia? "The master-spirit of the age—the founder of the surest and safest system of medical treatment," exclaims his disciple. "The successful inventor of a fanciful and delusive mode of practice," retorts his opponent. Which are we to credit?

It is little more than half a century since Homœopathia was discovered; yet Hahnemann is a familiar name on every tongue, a venerated one on many. The bitterest enemies to the system which he founded yield their homage to his gigantic intellectual powers, revere his manifold virtues, and admit that his learning, his numerous philanthropic deeds, and above all, the elevated purity of his character, have ever preserved him against the imputation of charlatanism. Whether his principles be received or rejected, his talents, his originality, and his singular history must ever render him a subject of general interest.

In 1839 Dr. Hahnemann was residing in Paris near the Gardens of the Luxembourg. During the winter of that year, desiring to consult him in behalf of an invalid friend, I made him my first visit. That I might obtain an audience as early as possible, I entered the carriage which was to transport me to his residence, at a quarter past nine o'clock in the morning. After about half an hour's ride, finding that the coachman stopped his horses without dismounting, I inquired if we had reached our destination: "No, Madam; it is not our turn yet. We must wait a little while. See! there is Dr. Hahnemann's house," he replied, pointing to a palace-like mansion at some distance. This mansion was surrounded by a massy stone wall with an iron gate in the centre. Impatient at the delay, I leaped out of the window and beheld a long line of carriages in front of us, driving one by one through the gate, and out again, as fast their occupants alighted. This was vexatious, I had taken such especial pains to be early—and all to no purpose. But if there was any consolation to be found in the knowledge that others were even worse off than ourselves, I might have comforted myself by looking in the opposite direction. Behind us stretched a file of coaches, lengthening every minute, and already quite as formidable as the one in front. I had unconsciously taken my station in the midst of a procession slowly advancing to pay homage to this modern Æsculapius.



I already knew something of Hahnemann's celebrity; but my opinion of his skill was marvellously fortified as I stared behind me, and before me, and then to the empty carriages driving away around me.

In about twenty minutes the carriage in which I sat wondering and waiting, during that time having moved a few paces forward every minute, at last drove briskly through the iron gate, around the spacious court, and deposited me, to my great satisfaction, at the front entrance of Hahnemann's magnificent dwelling. Three or four liveried domestics, assembled in a large hall, received the visitors as they alighted, and conducted them to the foot of the wide staircase. At the head of the first flight they were received by a couple more of these bedizened gentlemen, who ushered them into an elegant saloon, sumptuously furnished, and opening into a number of less spacious apartments.

The saloon was occupied by fashionably-dressed ladies and gentlemen, children with their nurses, and here and there an invalid reposing on a velvet couch or embroidered ottoman. The unexpected throng, the noisy hum of whispering voices, the laughter of sportive children, and the absence of vacant seats, were somewhat confusing. I entered at the same moment with a lady, who, with her nurse and child, had alighted from her carriage immediately before myself. Probably noticing my bewildered air, and observing that I was a stranger, she very courteously turned to me and said in French: "We shall be able to find seats in some other room; permit me to show you the way." I thanked her gratefully and followed her. After passing through a suite of thronged apartments, she led the way to a tasteful little boudoir, which was only occupied by one or two persons.

I knew that the lady who had so kindly acted as my conductress, was a person of rank, for I had noticed the coat of arms on the panels of her coach and remarked that her attendants were clothed in livery. But to meet with civility from strangers is of so common occurrence in France, that her graciousness awakened in me no surprise. I subsequently learnt that she was the Countess de R——, a young Italian, who had married a French count of some importance in the *beau monde*.

We had hardly seated ourselves in the quiet little boudoir, when a valet entered, and politely demanded our cards. They were presented, and he placed them in the order received, amongst a large number in his hand. It was obvious that we should be obliged to wait an indefinite period; and I soon commenced amusing myself by examining the fine paintings with which the walls were lavishly decorated—the pieces of sculpture—the costly vases scattered about the apartments—and a number of curious medals, heaped upon the centre-table. The sculpture, vases, medals, and even some of the paintings, had been presented to Hahnemann as memorials of the esteem and grati-

tude of his patients. Every room contained several marble busts of Hahnemann himself, some much larger than life, some as large, and some smaller. These also had been presented to him on different occasions as tokens of respect.

I was standing before a most lifelike portrait of the great doctor, lost in admiration of its masterly execution, when the young countess, who had retained her seat while I wandered around the room, joined me and said: "Do you know who painted that picture?"

"No," I replied, "but although I am not a judge of art, I should almost venture to say that it was the work of a master's hand."

"Undoubtedly it is a masterly piece of workmanship. It was executed, however, by Madame Hahnemann."

"Madame Hahnemann! is it possible! Is Hahnemann married, then?"

"To be sure; and so happily, that to become acquainted with his domestic history is of itself almost enough to induce one to venture upon matrimony."

"I am delighted to hear it. I knew nothing of him except as a skilful physician, and a man of extraordinary genius."

"His private history is equally interesting, and quite as remarkable, as his public."

"Have you known him a great while? How old is he? How long has he been married?" questioned I, anxious to obtain all the information in my power.

"I have been acquainted with his wife and himself several years. He is about eighty-four years old. He was married to his present wife in his eightieth year."

"Indeed! Was he a widower then? Is his second wife young, or as old as himself?"

"She is about forty-five years his junior, and she still retains much of the vivacity and freshness of youth."

"What induced her to marry him?"

"Veneration for his talents—esteem for his virtues—affection for himself—mingled, perhaps, with a spice of gratitude for his services to herself. You are a stranger to her, and will laugh if I say she *adores* him, but the term is not too strong to convey an idea of the truth."

"Pray tell me something of her history. I am already deeply interested."

"With pleasure. Hahnemann is the father of the most united, prosperous, and the happiest family I ever beheld. He had been many years a widower, when he was called in to attend Mademoiselle D'Hervilly, who was pronounced by her physicians to be in the last stage of consumption. He was residing at the time in Coethen. Marie Melonie D'Hervilly-Gohier, then his patient and now his wife, is descended from a noble French family of immense wealth. She had suffered a number of years with a pulmonary affection and disease of the heart. The most eminent physicians in Europe had fruitlessly endeavored to benefit her. After passing the winter in Italy, whither

she had been sent in the hope that a mild climate might effect what medicine had failed to accomplish, she returned to Germany, in a state which her physicians declared beyond the reach of medical aid. She is a woman of remarkable strength of mind and most comprehensive intellect. The fame of Hahnemann's wonderful cures had reached her, but she was unacquainted with his reasons for his peculiar mode of practice. Though so debilitated by protracted suffering that she was unable to make the slightest physical exertion, she examined his system for herself, and then determined upon consulting him. He became deeply interested in her case, and in an incredibly short time her sufferings were relieved, her cough subdued, and her *disease of the heart* assumed a different and more agreeable shape."

"And she married him out of *gratitude*?"

"By no means; she was charmed with his genius, his character, his manners, every thing about him; and conceived an affection for him perhaps deeper and truer than the passion which we generally call love."

"Which he reciprocated?"

"Nay, you question too closely; I cannot answer on which side the attachment first sprang. Nor do I know any reason why it should not have originated in the doctor himself. Madame Hahnemann is a woman of the most brilliant talents; her information is extensive, her mind highly cultivated, and she is a proficient in almost every elegant accomplishment you can name. Combine these attractions with that of a prepossessing person, and you will not find it easy to imagine a man insensible to her charms."

"How do Hahnemann's children like the idea of step-mother?"

"She is tenderly beloved by them all. Her delicacy and generosity towards them are worthy of mention. Hahnemann had amassed a large fortune, which she refused even during his lifetime to share with him. She was determined to give no room for the supposition that she could have been influenced by interested motives in forming this union. She stipulated, before her marriage, that she should ever be excluded from any participation in the avails of Hahnemann's estate; and induced him to settle the bulk of his fortune on the children of his first wife, merely reserving for himself an annuity sufficient for his personal expenses."

"How then was she to be provided for?"

"She was already independent as to fortune."

"Madame Hahnemann must undoubtedly be a very talented woman, if this painting is hers," said I, resuming my examination of the fine portrait, which had first attracted my attention."

"Not only that one but several others in the larger apartments," replied Madame de R——. "Some of her paintings have even been admitted into the galleries of the Louvre."

Thus her name is classed with those of the most distinguished French artists. She is a poetess, too, and her works have won a truly flattering approbation from the public."

"A poetess! Where will her qualifications end?"

"I almost believe they have no end. She is mistress of five or six languages, which she both writes and speaks with ease and fluency."

"She appears to be worthy, indeed, of being the wife of Hahnemann."

"He thinks so, I assure you. He would not now find it so easy to dispense with her services."

"Is he infirm, then?"

"Not in the least. He has always enjoyed excellent health. His sight and hearing are unimpaired. His activity is remarkable. Even yet there are an elasticity in his movements and sprightliness in his manners which make you feel that something of youth has been left to him even in age. He would never remind you of the fable of the frog, whose discerning patients cried, 'Physician, cure thyself.'"

"Perhaps that is quite as remarkable as any thing you have told me about him; medical men generally look as though they needed, but feared to try, the effects of their own medicines. Since he is so active, I suppose it would be possible to induce him to visit a patient?"

"I do not think that could be easily accomplished. In a case of great peril, perhaps, you might obtain the services of his wife."

"His wife? Why surely ——"

(To be Continued.)

#### CIMEX LECTULARIUS.

DOCTOR KIRBY.—I think it worth while to call the attention of the practitioners of medicine to the *Cimex Lectularius*, as a remedy for intermittent fevers. During the last season I have found it effectual in whatever potency used, and have cured more than twenty of the worst kind of patients imaginable. The pathogenesis is found in the new *Symptomen-Codez*, and covers a very extensive ground. It is to be observed, however, that its effect is always more signal and sure, in cases which have become obstinate from abuse of Cinchona and other *specifics*, and have relapsed several times. In such cases I have never known it fail. I have usually, in quotidian, given one dose of two or three globules, just as the sweating is fairly set in, and the patient begins to feel somewhat more comfortable. In tertians, I have given it again in about twenty-four hours after the first dose. The first paroxysm after taking the remedy is generally much severer and earlier, but shorter. It generally ceases entirely after this aggravation, or diminishes gradually but rapidly, until it quite disappears. I have repeated it once in seven to fourteen days, afterward as a prophylactic; but when not thus repeated, and a slight return is threatened, a single dose will effectually cure it.

G.

Buffalo, Sept. 25, 1849.

## OBITUARY.

It is with unfeigned grief we announce the death of RALPH ALBERT SNOW, M. D. This sad event occurred on the 4th of October, 1849. Sometime since he moved from this city to Wilkesbarre, Pa., and very soon his practice became greatly extended in that unhealthy district at particular seasons, and the success which attended his labors necessarily accumulated a weight of business and care that pressed heavily upon a naturally feeble constitution. Under such circumstances we were not surprised to learn the melancholy result; a *typhus fever*, supervening upon exhaustion and overwork. So earnest in his spirit, he did not feel the grasp of the grave disease that had invaded his system, but with a devotion peculiar to himself, stimulated by a profound conviction of the great importance of the medical reform in which he was engaged, he tasked from day to day to its uttermost, his steadily declining strength, which his increasing business seemed to demand, until at last he sunk upon his bed completely exhausted;—but to die. If he had thought less of his patients and less of his profession, Dr. Snow would have been living to this day.

Dr. Snow was a graduate of the medical department of the University of the city of New-York. He possessed good mental endowments, was of industrious habits in his profession, and an ardent advocate of pure Homœopathia. He was decidedly the most unselfish person we ever met with, and it appeared to us that his life was a series of unjust acts towards himself. For he was so devoted to the propagation of a true medical science and art, that human sufferings in disease might be mitigated or fully removed, that his private interests, seemingly, were to him a secondary consideration. Early in his professional career he adopted, through a conviction of their truth, the doctrine and practice of Hahnemann, and no one ever accused him of deviating from that system in the treatment of diseases. He was, in all respects, a consistent Homœopath. The *materia medica* was his daily study, and few excelled him in a knowledge of the pathogenesis of drugs. The investigation of chronic diseases suited his taste and his mind, and few have been more successful in that most difficult treatment. He saw, with unusual distinctness, the tendency of Allopathic practice to induce an

entailment of disease in the human system; and particularly did he urge that *quinine* was a frequent cause of the development of tubercular disease, and that such cases would be rapidly fatal, for no remedy, yet known, would even prolong life. The pernicious effects of drugs as employed by the people themselves and by Allopathic practitioners he carefully studied, and he often stated to his colleagues that it was a serious matter to administer medicine, and should not be done unless there were positively known indications. He often said to us, that pure Homœopathia, as taught by Hahnemann, if faithfully adhered to, would secure the confidence of the people in the system, and upon this depends its success.

In our opinion the Homœopathic school has lost one of her ablest members. We deeply sympathize with the people of Wilkesbarre in their loss. They had learned to appreciate his talents and usefulness; and their kind and incessant attentions to him during his sickness, and to his afflicted family, and the very large attendance at his funeral, show they regarded his death a public calamity to their town.

At a meeting of the Homœopathic Society of New-York, held Oct. 23d, 1849, B. F. Joslin, M. D., in the chair, the following resolutions, presented by S. R. Kirby, M. D., seconded by J. H. Allen, M. D., were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That in the death of Ralph Albert Snow, M. D., the "Homœopathic Society of New-York," has lost one of its ablest members.

Resolved, That in our late associate, Dr. R. A. Snow, we recognized a talented, industrious and skilful physician.

Resolved, That we, the members of this Society, hereby express to the widow, orphan children, brothers, sisters, and other relations of the deceased, our deep sympathy for the loss they, as well as ourselves, have sustained.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Society, R. A. Snow, M. D., lived and died a true disciple of the illustrious Hahnemann. In his last sickness, he demanded a solemn promise from his beloved wife, that should he lose his reason, none but a genuine homœopath should be allowed to prescribe for him.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the widow of the late Dr. Snow, and that they be published in the Evening Post, New-York Tribune, and the American Journal of Homœopathy.

B. F. BOWERS, M. D.,  
Secretary.

### ANOTHER MODE OF RAISING THE WIND.

We heard the other day a funny story running in this wise: A couple of gentlemen from the South came to Gotham—one to have an operation performed on the throat, and the other to bear him company. The job was duly accomplished, the sufferer laid by to recreate, and the two bowled merrily on; till, in one of their stated visits to the worthy practitioner, that individual turns upon the well man and gravely tells him something is the matter with him too—ending with a strong recommendation that he also should be operated on! "Do you experience no trouble," anxiously inquires the man of steel, "from those unpleasant symptoms?" "What!—how?—*what* symptoms?" says the other. "I don't know, really, that anything ails me!" "Ah! my dear Sir," rejoins the quærist, "you are not aware of the extent of the malady. I assure you that your health will be greatly benefited if my advice is followed." The victim did n't know exactly what to make of it—but supposing that the Doctor knew better than he, consented; and the overjoyed practitioner instantly carves out a goodly-sized portion of the man's *palate*, telling him that he will now find speech, etc., much more free and comfortable than ever before—and winds up by presenting to the astonished man's vision a bill of \$15, for services rendered! The demand was paid with but a bad grace, it must be confessed, and the unlucky wight so "taken in and done for," went about his business a little the wiser for his taste of the tricks of the trade in New-York. Reader! as long as you can prevent it, never suffer a "Doctor," or anybody else, to cut your throat until you *know* that something is the matter with it.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

The above is no fancy sketch, but a fact. Allopaths have a right, we suppose, on account of their pretended *legitimacy*, to monopolize the humbuggery in medicine, and no one, as they think, ought to complain. It is now the fashion in this city to cut off tonsils and uvulas, for what purpose we are not advised, perhaps to improve the voice. Lunar caustic is in great demand among us, and, hundreds daily submit to be burnt with it in the throat, to cure *bronchitis* as is alleged, but of all the "humbugs" in medicine of this age, none will compare with this, yet it will have its day. To cure a genuine *bronchitis* by caustic applications cannot be done, and whoever expects to do so, knows very little of the nature of that disease. The day for the doctrine of local diseases has passed, and any treatment founded upon it, will fail.

Did the Creator intend tonsils and uvulas to be of any use? The practice of the day indicates that Allopaths think not.

### HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Session of 1849-50. Lectures will commence on the first Monday of October, and continue until the first of March ensuing, and will be delivered under the following arrangement.

*Materia Medica and Therapeutics*, by CALED B. MATTHEWS, M. D.

*Homœopathic Institutes and the Practice of Medicine*, by WILLIAM S. HELMUTH, M. D.

*Botany and Medical Jurisprudence*, by SAMUEL FREEDLEY, M. D.

*Clinical Medicine*, by CHARLES NEIDHARD, M. D.

*Obstetrics and the Diseases of Women and Children*, by WALTER WILLIAMSON, M. D.

*Physiology and Pathology*, by ALVAN E. SMALL, M. D.

*Chemistry and Toxicology*, by MATTHEW SEMPLE, M. D.

*Surgery*, by FRANCIS SIMS, M. D.

*Anatomy*, by WILLIAM A. GARDINER, M. D.

Clinical instruction in Medicine and Surgery, given at the Dispensary connected with the College, daily.—Students who have attended one or more full courses of instruction in other medical schools, may become candidates for graduation, by attendance upon one full course in this school.

Amount of fees for a full course of lectures, \$100.00

Matriculation fee, paid only once, - 5.00

Practical Anatomy, - - - 10.00

Graduation fee, - - - 30.00

Students who have attended two full courses in other schools, - - - 30.00.

The Commencement will take place early in March.

W. WILLIAMSON, M. D., Dean,  
No. 80 North 11th St., Phila.

Volumes 1, 2, and 3 of this Journal may be had at \$1.00 each of Mr. Rademacher, Philadelphia; Otis Clapp, Boston; and of the Editor, 762 Broadway.

Subscriptions for this Journal will be received as heretofore, by Otis Clapp, Boston, Mass.; by J. F. Desilver, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rademacher, Phila.